1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 :TRAM -NU HOANG :LAM, Case No. CV 14-01311 DDP (AJWx) 11 Plaintiff, 12 13 ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THIS CASE v. SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR LACK THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE OF JURISDICTION UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., 15 16 Defendants. 17 18 Plaintiff is ordered to show cause why this case should not be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. As an initial matter, the 19 basis of Plaintiff's complaint is somewhat unclear to the court. 20 21 The court notes that a complaint must include a short and plain 22 statement of the claim and of the court's jurisdiction, and must make clear the relief sought. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). 23 2.4 Here, Plaintiff appears to seek an ordering directing 25 Defendant "to prescribe special relief to [Plaintiff] in its narrow 26 power of its broad powers specifically within naturalization" It is not clear from Plaintiff's Complaint, however, that 27 Plaintiff has applied for naturalization. The court is not,

therefore, persuaded that a case or controversy presently exists. See Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555, 560 (1992). Accordingly, the court orders Plaintiff to file a brief, not to exceed five pages, within 10 days of the date of this Order, showing why this action should not be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Plaintiff should also deliver a courtesy copy to chambers, Room 244-J, Second Floor, 312 N. Spring Street, Los Angeles. The court will regard any failure to file an explanatory brief as consent to dismiss this matter. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: April 15, 2014 DEAN D. United States District Judge